

REMARKS

The office action of January 7, 2009 has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of this case, as amended, is requested. Claims 1-14, 43, 46, 49, and 52-68 remain in this case, with claims 15-42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50 and 51 being canceled.

Claim 1 and 52 were amended to clarify the subject matter being claimed. Support for the amendment is found in paragraphs [0006], [0008], and [0014] of the specification as originally filed and in Figure 2.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 1, 4, 6, 43, 52, 55, and 57 were objected to because of informalities.

The Applicant has capitalized the word "Internet" in the above claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-14, 43, 46, 52-66, and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wallace (US 6,564,121). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Wallace teaches using a web server remotely from or in a separate location from a dispensing device in order to control the pharmaceuticals being dispensed.

Applicant's amended claim 1 requires *a web server and an asset control system of at least one security asset manager to be co-located* and that the web server stores information regarding tangible asset transactions at the asset control system and the remote user can access and control the asset management system remotely by communication via the Internet between the web browser and the web server (emphasis added).

Wallace does not teach or suggest co-locating the web server with the dispensing device and the control system controlling the tangible assets or pharmaceuticals being dispensed.

Applicant's amended claim 52 requires the steps of storing information in the web server regarding tangible asset transactions at the asset control system, and the *web server being co-*

located within the asset control system communicating with the web browser at the remote user, such that the remote user can access and control the asset management system remotely by communication via the Internet between the web browser and the web server (emphasis added).

Wallace does not teach or suggest the step of storing information in the web server regarding tangible asset transactions at the asset control system, or the step of the web server being co-located within the asset control system communicating with the web browser at the remote user, such that the remote user can access and control the asset management system remotely by communication via the Internet between the web browser and the web server.

Therefore, it is respectfully suggested that the rejection of independent claim 1 and 52 as being anticipated by Wallace (US 6,564,121) is overcome. Dependent claims 2-14, 43, 46, 53-66, and 68, being dependent upon and further limiting independent claims 1 and 52, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 49 and 67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace (US 6,564,121) in view of Blad (US 6,675,067).

Applicant respectfully disagrees, and believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over Wallace (US 6,564,121), for the reasons given above in respect to the section 102 rejections of claims 1 and 52, upon which claims 49 and 67 depend respectively. The argument above as to the novelty of claims 1 and 52 is repeated here by reference.

Regarding claim 1, upon which claim 49 depends, Blad does not teach or suggest co-locating the web server with the dispensing device and the control system controlling the tangible assets or pharmaceuticals being dispensed.

Regarding claim 52, upon which claim 67 depends, Blad does not teach or suggest the steps of storing information in the web server regarding tangible asset transactions at the asset control system, or the step of the web server being co-located within the asset control system communicating with the web browser at the remote user, such that the remote user can access

and control the asset management system remotely by communication via the Internet between the web browser and the web server.

Therefore, dependent claims 49 and 67 being dependent upon and further limiting independent claims 1 and 52, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over the prior art, and that this case is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

"Recognizing that Internet communications are not secured, I hereby authorize the PTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file."

Respectfully Submitted:
George Eckerdt

By: /Lynda Wood, Reg.#53791/
Lynda Wood, Reg. No. 53,791
Agent for Applicant

BROWN & MICHAELS, P.C.
400 M&T Bank Building - 118 N. Tioga St.
Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 256-2000 • (607) 256-3628 (fax)
e-mail: docket@bpmlegal.com
Dated: March 25, 2009